

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-17 are pending, in which claims 1 and 10 are currently amended. No new matter is introduced.

The Office Action mailed September 15, 2008 rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, claims 1, 2, 6-11, and 15-17 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Pruthi et al.* (US 2002/0105911) in view of *Bahadiroglu* (US 2002/0186660), and claims 3-5 and 12-14 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Pruthi et al.* (US 2002/0105911) and *Bahadiroglu* (US 2002/0186660) in view of *Leftwich* (US 6,356,256).

In response to the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, claim 1 has been amended to include a clear antecedent basis for “the at least one service access point.” Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6-11, and 15-17 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Pruthi et al.* in view of *Bahadiroglu*, the Office Action contends that *Pruthi et al.* discloses the claimed display of a sequence of messages (relying on Fig. 17 of *Pruthi et al.*) and the claimed display of a course of the first characteristic feature (relying on the “TCP Level Bit Rate” in Fig. 20 of *Pruthi et al.*). However, to whatever extent these displays in *Pruthi et al.* may be similar to the claimed features, it is clear that Fig. 17 and Fig. 20 in *Pruthi et al.* are directed to two separate displays, rather than to “a display device” for displaying a first region and a second region, as in claims 1 and 10.

In any event, in order to reduce the issues for potential appeal, and to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 10 to emphasize the use of a “single” display having two distinct regions therein, by reciting “a display device for displaying, **on a single screen**, a first region and a second region” in claim 1 and “displaying the sequence of messages...in a **first region of a single screen** of a display device” and “a course of the first

characteristic feature is displayed in a **second region of the single screen** of the display device” in claim 10.

Since neither *Pruthi et al.* nor *Bahadiroglu* discloses or suggests “a display device for displaying, **on a single screen, a first region and a second region,**” wherein the sequence of messages is displayed in the first region and “a course of the first characteristic feature is displayed on the display device in the second region” (as in claim 1), or “displaying the sequence of messages...in a **first region of a single screen** of a display device” and “a course of the first characteristic feature is displayed in a **second region of the single screen** of the display device” as in claim 10), the claimed subject matter cannot be obvious over the applied references, within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6-11, and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Since *Leftwich* does not provide for the deficiencies, noted above, of the primary references (*Leftwich* being employed for a teaching of automatically producing markers by a selector), claims 3-5 and 12-14 are also allowable.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 3-5 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (703) 519-9952 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

P28318/US (01012-1038)

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 504213 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG MORI & STEINER, P.C.

December 1, 2008
Date

/Phouphanomketh Ditthavong/
Phouphanomketh Ditthavong
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44658

Errol A. Krass
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 60090

918 Prince Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel. (703) 519-9952
Fax. (703) 519-9958